

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS FO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.tepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION		
10/561,841	12/22/2005	Yukio Miyairi	126400 3189		
25944 7590 G4282009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850		EXAMINER			
			MAYEKAR, KISHOR		
		4850		PAPER NUMBER	
			1795		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/561.841 MIYAIRI ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Kishor Mavekar 1795 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2008. 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected	to by the	Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on	is/are:	a) 🗌 accep

_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or	(f).
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	

Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage

application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Α	tta	ch	ım	e	n	t(s

Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	
--------------------------------------	--

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PT

Paper No(s)/Mail Date 02/06 &03/08.

Λ	Interview Summary (PTO-41
4) □	
	Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other:

Specification

 The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the continuing data on page 1 is missing.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

 Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitation "plate-like" is confusing as to the difference between "plate-like" and "plate". And the recitations "generating plasma" and "application of voltage" in the last three lines are confusing as whether "plasma" and voltage" are the same as that recited in the claim preamble or different.

In claim 2, the same is applied to claim 1 to the recitation "plate-like". The recitation "a basic unit electrode" is confusing as to its correlation with the recited unit

electrode of claim 1. The recitation "as an external shape of the basic unit electrode" is confusing as whether the recited external shape is the same shape recited earlier or different. Further, the claim is confusing as whether the recited structures are part of the plasma generating electrode of claim 1.

In claim 3 and its depending claim 4, the same is applied to claim 2 as whether the recited structures are part of the plasma generating electrode of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC \$ 102 and \$ 103

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Art Unit: 1795

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 1, 5 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Li et al. (USD 6,979,892 B2). Li's invention is directed to a laminated co-fired sandwiched element for non-thermal plasma reactor. Li discloses a plasma reactor comprising a plasma generating electrode comprising all the structures as claimed (Fig. 26; c. 10, 1. 57-62; c. 1, 1. 16-18 and c. 11, 1. 9-10).

As to the subject matter of each of claim 5, Li discloses it in Fig. 5.

7. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li '892. Li is applied as above but silent on the subject matter of each of claims 6-9. The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li's teachings because the selection of the opening percentage, the thickness of the unit electrode, the width of the protrusion and the distance between adjacent protrusions would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art

8. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li '892 in view of Nelson et al. (US 6,821,493 B2). The difference between Li as applied above and the instant claims are the subject matter recited in each of the instant claims. Nelson teaches in a non-thermal plasma reactor the limitations (Figs. 6-8). The subject matter as a whole would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Li's teachings as shown by Nelson because the selection of any of known equivalent methods of preparing a multi-cell plasma generating electrode would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kishor Mayekar whose telephone number is (571) 272-1339. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

Art Unit: 1795

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kishor Mayekar/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795